arXiv:1401.5443v2 [hep-ph] 30 Jan 2014

Top-quark forward-backward asymmetry from a color-octet t-channel resonance

Li Cheng[1*], Alper Hayreter[2†] and German Valencia[1‡]

[1] *Department of Physics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011. and*

[2] *Department of Natural and Mathematical Sciences, Ozyegin University, 34794 Istanbul Turkey.*

(Dated: February 3, 2014)

Abstract

We consider new physics contributions to the top-quark forward-backward asymmetry from a neutral V_8^0 or charged V_8^+ color-octet vector exchanged in the t-channel. We study the phenomenological constraints on these particles arising from the Tevatron and LHC7 measurements and compare them with those on their color singlet counterparts Z' and W'. We find that the color octets fare better than the singlets in that they generate a lower A_C, a lower high-invariant mass cross-section at LHC7 and a lower same sign top-pair cross-section. However, they also generate a lower A_{FB} than their color-singlet counterparts.

* Electronic address: lcheng@iastate.edu

† Electronic address: alper.hayreter@ozyegin.edu.tr

‡ Electronic address: valencia@iastate.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

The forward-backward asymmetry was first observed in top-quark pair production at the Tevatron D0 experiment, $A_{FB} = (19.6 \pm 6.5)\%$ [1], to be larger than the standard model (SM) expectation of around 6% [2, 3]. Although this effect is only at the two standard deviation level, it remains a hint for possible new physics after improved measurements and calculations.

Since the first D0 result, the asymmetry measurement has been repeated by both D0 and CDF with increased luminosity with the latest CDF result being obtained with 9.4 fb^{-1} [4]. The corresponding theoretical predictions have been improved to beyond NLO [5] with the observation remaining about two sigma above the SM prediction. This situation has produced a large number of papers exploring the possibility of a new physics explanation for the deviation. Among the first possibilities considered was an axigluon [6–14] for which a window in the light mass region remains a viable option [15]. Many other models have been discussed in this context, including extra dimensions [16–18]; composite models [19, 20]; models with Z' bosons [21–31]; models with W' (or both) bosons [32–38]; models with extra scalars [39–47]. Model independent analyses in terms of effective operators also exist [48–56]; as well as studies that compare different models and study the implications for observables at LHC [57–68].

A recent comparison of models has found that it is very hard for simple models (those consisting of the exchange of one new particle) to satisfy all existing constraints from cross-sections and asymmetries at the Tevatron and at the LHC [69]. Amongst these simple models there is one case that has not been studied in detail before, new vector color octet particles exchanged in the t-channel. Our purpose in this paper is to consider this case, comparing our results to the color-singlet counterparts Z' and W'. More complicated models considered before in Ref. [46], include color-octet vectors that can be exchanged in the t-channel. But this particular effect exists in isolation within that model only for the charged vector case. Ref. [70] also presented a catalog of possible resonances contributing to A_{FB}, of which a neutral color-octet vector in the t-channel is a possibility. Neither one of these papers presents a comprehensive study of the effect of color-octet resonances in the t-channel, which we do in this paper at the `MadGraph5` level.

II. OBSERVABLES

The original discrepancy with the SM prediction was observed at the Tevatron in the top-quark forward-backward asymmetry

$$A_{FB} = \frac{N(\Delta y > 0) - N(\Delta y < 0)}{N(\Delta y > 0) + N(\Delta y < 0)} \tag{1}$$

where $\Delta y = y_t - y_{\bar{t}}$ is the difference between the rapidities of the top quark and anti-quark with the z-axis taken along the proton direction. This asymmetry is equivalent

to the top-quark forward-backward asymmetry in the top-quark production angle in the $t\bar{t}$ rest frame. The asymmetry has now been measured repeatedly by both D0 and CDF [1, 4, 71–73] with results that have been consistently above the SM expectation. Within the SM, the asymmetry originates through QCD interference effects at order $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$. It was first predicted by Kuhn and Rodrigo [2, 3, 78–81] and has been revisited several times since then [74–77], including beyond NLO analysis [5]. For our study we will use the latest CDF results available [4], as well as the theory prediction quoted by CDF as obtained using the NLO event generator POWHEG,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{FB} &= (16.4 \pm 4.7)\% \\ A_{FB} &= (6.6 \pm 2.0)\% \text{ POWHEG} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We will assume that potential new physics contributions are small, as supported by the agreement between theory and experiment for the $t\bar{t}$ production cross-section, for example. In this case any new physics contributions to the asymmetry can be treated at leading order and simply added to the SM result. The numbers in Eq. 2 then allow for a new physics contribution to the asymmetry, adding all errors in quadrature,

$$0.05 < A_{FB}^{new} < 0.15. \tag{3}$$

In addition to the integrated (over $t\bar{t}$ invariant mass) forward backward asymmetry, the Tevatron experiments have also measured an approximately linear dependence of A_{FB} on m_{tt}. As a second observable to constrain new physics scenarios we adopt the high invariant mass asymmetry as reported by CDF and the corresponding theoretical prediction quoted by them in Ref. [4],

$$\begin{aligned} A_{FB}(M_{t\bar{t}} \geq 450 \text{ GeV}) &= (29.5 \pm 5.8 \pm 3.3)\% \\ A_{FB}(M_{t\bar{t}} \geq 450 \text{ GeV}) &= (10.0 \pm 3.0)\% \text{ POWHEG.} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Again this leaves room for a new physics contribution after adding all errors in quadrature,

$$0.12 < A_{FB}^{new}(M_{t\bar{t}} \geq 450 \text{ GeV}) < 0.27 \tag{5}$$

The total $t\bar{t}$ production cross-section can also provide a powerful constraint on new physics given the good agreement between the measured and SM predicted values. The combined D0 and CDF results are given in Ref. [82] which also quotes the corresponding SM result at NNLO+NNLL QCD based on Ref. [83] for $m_t = 172.5$ GeV,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= 7.35^{+0.28}_{-0.33} \text{ pb} \quad \text{SM} \\ \sigma &= (7.60 \pm 0.41) \text{ pb} \quad \text{D0} - \text{CDF combination} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Adding all errors in quadrature, this allows a new physics contribution to the $p\bar{p} \to t\bar{t}$ cross-section at Tevatron energies

$$\sigma - \sigma_{SM} = (0.25 \pm 0.5) \text{ pb.} \tag{7}$$

As first noted in Ref. [2, 3], it is possible to define a related charge asymmetry for proton proton colliders. Taking advantage of the larger average valence quark momentum than the average anti-quark momentum in a proton, one of the observables that have been proposed for the LHC is a charge asymmetry defined by

$$A_C \;=\; \frac{N(\Delta|y|>0) - N(\Delta|y|<0)}{N(\Delta|y|>0) + N(\Delta|y|<0)}, \tag{8}$$

where $\Delta|y| = |y_t| - |y_{\bar{t}}|$. This asymmetry has been measured both by CMS and ATLAS with somewhat different results, but in agreement with the SM. The CMS result compared to its SM prediction is [84]

$$\begin{aligned} A_C &= 0.004 \pm 0.010 \pm 0.012 \\ A_C &= 0.0115 \pm 0.0006 \text{ SM here POWHEG} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the first error is statistical and the second systematic. If we again add all errors in quadrature, this leaves room for a new physics contribution to the charge asymmetry

$$-0.023 < A_C^{new} < 0.008 \tag{10}$$

The corresponding result from ATLAS [85] is

$$\begin{aligned} A_C &= 0.057 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.015 \\ A_C &= 0.006 \pm 0.002 \text{ SM here} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

which allows a new physics contribution

$$0.023 < A_C^{new} < 0.08 \tag{12}$$

Other related asymmetries have been proposed and measured at the LHC but we will only use A_C for the reconstructed $t\bar{t}$ pair in this paper. As with the Tevatron, the total cross-section also places severe constraints on potential new physics. The theoretical [83], ATLAS [86] and CMS [87] numbers for 7 TeV collisions at the LHC are respectively given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= 172 \text{ pb} \;\; \text{SM} \\ \sigma &= (177 \pm 3^{+8}_{-7} \pm 7) \text{ pb} \;\; \text{ATLAS} \\ \sigma &= (161.9 \pm 2.5^{+5.1}_{-5.0} \pm 3.6) \text{ pb} \;\; \text{CMS} \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The theory uncertainties from scale dependence and parton distribution functions estimated at about 3% each. The CMS and ATLAS uncertainties quoted correspond to statistical, systematic and luminosity in that order. Adding all errors in quadrature and using the ATLAS result allows a new physics contribution to the cross-section

$$\sigma - \sigma_{SM} \leq 18 \text{ pb}. \tag{14}$$

The CMS result, being below the SM prediction, would constrain new physics contributions to the cross-section much more severely, our results using Eq. 14 would be in agreement with the CMS result at about $\sim 3\sigma$ level.

In addition to the total cross-section, it has been pointed out that the high tail cross-section at the LHC provides another constraint on new physics [64, 65]. In Ref. [88] ATLAS reported that in the combined lepton plus jets channels at 7 TeV with 2.05 fb^{-1} the high mass tail cross-section

$$\frac{\sigma(pp \to t\bar{t})(m_{t\bar{t}} > 950 \text{ GeV})}{\sigma(pp \to t\bar{t})} = (1.2 \pm 0.5)\%, \tag{15}$$

about 1 σ below the theoretical prediction. This has been converted into a 99% c.l upper limit $\sigma/\sigma_{SM} \leq 1.3$ in this mass bin in Ref. [69]. The CMS result is a bit higher than the ATLAS result but uses different binning [89].

Finally, for the case of a neutral new particle such as a Z', it is known that there is a strong constraint from same charge top-pair production at the LHC [25–27]. The experimental limit from LHC7 at 95% c.l. for the inclusive cross-section from ATLAS is

$$\sigma(pp \to tt) < 4 \text{ pb} \tag{16}$$

and the limit from CMS is weaker [90].

III. VECTOR COLOR OCTETS IN THE t-CHANNEL

As already mentioned, our aim in this paper is to complete the picture of simple new physics contributions to the top-quark forward backward asymmetry by considering the t channel exchange of spin one color octet resonances. These resonances may arise, for example, in techicolor models as color-octet neutral or charged technirhos [91–93]. The origin of these resonances, however, is not relevant for our phenomenological analysis which will simply follow from the effective Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} \;=\; -\frac{g_{W_R}}{2}\;\bar{t}\gamma_\mu T_a(1+\gamma_5)\;d\;V_8^{+\mu} \;-\; \frac{g_{Z_R}}{2}\;\bar{t}\gamma_\mu T_a(1+\gamma_5)\;u\;V_8^{0\mu} \;+\; \text{h. c.} \tag{17}$$

The form chosen is of course motivated by the existing studies of Z' and W' contributions. In particular the flavor structure is chosen to maximize the contribution to the A_{FB}, as is the use of right-handed couplings. We will find it useful to compare our results to those of Z' and W' models in the form

$$\mathcal{L} \;=\; -\frac{g_{W_R}}{2}\;\bar{t}\gamma_\mu(1+\gamma_5)\;d\;V^{+\mu} \;-\; \frac{g_{Z_R}}{2}\;\bar{t}\gamma_\mu(1+\gamma_5)\;u\;V^{0\mu} \;+\; \text{h. c.} \tag{18}$$

It is interesting to note that a recent study of new physics contributions to A_{FB} in terms of effective four-fermion operators arising from s-channel exchanges of new particles finds that color octet structures provide a better fit to the data [94]. That analysis does not cover our model of Eq. 17 because the color structure arising from the t-channel exchange of the new vectors does not appear in their basis of

effective operators. Our analysis of the new physics contributions will only be at leading order, thus ignoring interference between the new physics and NLO SM where the color structure could play an important role. It nevertheless differs from the color singlet structure of Z' and W' models as in Eq. 18 because the different color structure gives a different sign to the interference terms in the differential cross-section. Explicitly, the terms corresponding to the parton level process $q\bar{q} \to t\bar{t}$ including the dominant SM gluon exchange amplitude and the exchange of a t-channel $V^{0,+}$color octet or singlet are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\sigma}{dt} &= C_{f1}\,\frac{g_s^4}{8\pi s^4}\left(2sm_t^2+(t-m_t^2)^2+(u-m_t^2)^2\right)\\ &+ C_{f3}\,\frac{g_V^4}{16\pi s^2(t-m_V^2)^2}\left((u-m_t^2)^2(L_V^4+R_V^4)-2L_V^2R_V^2s(t+u)\right)\\ &- C_{f2}\,\frac{g_V^2g_s^2}{8\pi s^3(t-m_V^2)}\left((u-m_t^2)^2+m_t^2s)(L_V^2+R_V^2)\right) \qquad (19)\end{aligned}$$

where g_V and m_V refer to either g_{W_R} and m_{W_R} or to g_{Z_R} and m_{Z_R}. For purely right-handed couplings as in Eq. 17 or in Eq. 18 $R_V = 1$ and $L_V = 0$. The color factors for the case of color singlet resonances are given by

$$2C_{f1} = C_{f2} = \frac{4}{9}, \quad C_{f3} = 1; \qquad (20)$$

and for color octet resonances by

$$C_{f1} = C_{f3} = \frac{2}{9}, \quad C_{f2} = -\frac{2}{27}. \qquad (21)$$

The different color factors are responsible for the different weights of the new physics contributions, including a possible sign change.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

For our numerical study we implement the Lagrangian of Eq. 17 and Eq. 18 into `MadGraph5` [95] with the aid of `FeynRules` [96]. We use the resulting model UFO file to generate top-quark pair events for different values of couplings and masses in a range that roughly reproduces the new contribution to A_{FB} as in Eq. 3. We study the different observables discussed above for these ranges and compare the cases of color octet and color singlet resonances. Finally we fit the numerical results for the case of $m_V = 500$ GeV to obtain approximate expressions for cross-sections and asymmetries in terms of the new couplings. The results of this fit are presented in the Appendix.

In Figure 1 we plot the deviation in the Tevatron $t\bar{t}$ cross-section from its SM value as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time. The range we show is limited by the charged color octet V_8^+ which does not produce a very large A_{FB}, the points shown corresponding to $1.4 < g_{W_R} < 2$. To obtain a similar asymmetry with

V_8^0 we show the range $0.8 < g_{Z_R} < 1.2$. The correlation between cross-section and asymmetry exhibited in Figure 1 for the color-octets shows that A_{FB} can't be much larger than about 7% if the cross-section is to remain within the 1σ range of Eq. 7. In the same figure we show in the right panel the case of color singlet resonances using the ranges $0.5 < g_{W_R} < 2$ and $1.15 < g_{Z_R} < 1.4$. The color singlets allow much larger asymmetries due to the relatively larger color factor in the interference term in Eq. 19. The corresponding cross-sections are also lower for the singlet as there is destructive interference with the SM. In fact all the points shown in Figure 1 for V^0 (color singlet) have a cross-section below the 1σ bound of Eq. 7.



FIG. 1: Deviation in the Tevatron cross-section from its SM value as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time.

In Figure 2 we plot the high invariant mass Tevatron asymmetry $A_{FB}^{new}(m_{t\bar{t}} > 450$ GeV) as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time using the same couplings as in Fig. 1. The results indicate that the color-octet resonances can only reproduce the lower ends of the 1σ ranges of Eqs. 3 and 5. The right panel, corresponding to the color singlets, corroborates that a Z' tends to over-predict the high invariant mass asymmetry [63].



FIG. 2: $A_{FB}^{new}(m_{t\bar{t}} > 450$ GeV) as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time.

In Figure 3 we plot the charge asymmetry A_C^{new} for LHC7 as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time with the same couplings used in Fig. 1. The correlation between these two observables is such that a neutral boson is preferred over a charged

boson by the measured A_C. In fact, the tighter CMS constraint from Eq. 10 at the 1σ level, only allows the neutral color-octet. The panel on the right, again for the color singlets, corroborates that current LHC data disfavors a W' as it over-predicts A_C [63, 69].



FIG. 3: A_C^{new} as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time

In Figure 4 we plot the deviation in the LHC7 cross-section from its SM value as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time with the same couplings used in Fig. 1. All the points shown satisfy the 1σ range from Eq. 14 obtained from the ATLAS result but the W' and its color octet counterpart V_8^+ give the largest cross-sections, possibly in conflict with the CMS measurement.



FIG. 4: Deviation in the LHC7 cross-section from its SM value as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time.

In Figure 5 we plot the high invariant mass cross-section at LHC7 as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time using the same couplings as in Fig. 1. Again the neutral resonances fare better than the charged ones and the color-octet much better than the color singlet in a comparison with Eq. 15.

Finally in Figure 6 we show the cross-section for double top-quark production, $\sigma(pp \to tt)$, at LHC7 for the neutral bosons of mass 500 GeV. The figure indicates that the color singlet Z' quickly runs into trouble with the ATLAS limit on this process, Eq. 16, but the color octet fares better.

We now turn to the question of whether there is an optimal region in parameter space to satisfy all the constraints. To this end we use the approximate fits presented



FIG. 5: High invariant mass cross-section at LHC7 as a function of A_{FB}^{new} for one resonance at a time



FIG. 6: $\sigma(pp \to tt)$ at LHC7 for the neutral bosons of mass 500 GeV.

in the Appendix to produce Figures 7, 8 and 9 where we compare the allowed regions in the $g_{W_R} - g_{Z_R}$ plane for the different observables discussed above. Figure 7 shows a cross-section and an asymmetry at the Tevatron that are compatible at the one-sigma level with a narrow band of parameter space for the color-octet. The new physics required to increase the asymmetry also increases the cross-section and the two are compatible only for the lower end of the 1σ range for A_{FB}^{new}. This situation is different from the color-singlet where there is destructive interference between the SM and the new physics.

In Figure 8 we examine the effect of the high invariant mass observables. The 99% c.l upper limit $\sigma/\sigma_{SM}(m_{t\bar{t}} > 950 \text{ GeV}) \leq 1.3$ from ATLAS quoted in Ref. [69] ruling out both the color-singlet and color octet-resonances as explanations for A_{FB}. We also show in the figure the boundaries corresponding to $\sigma/\sigma_{SM}(m_{t\bar{t}} > 950 \text{ GeV}) = 2.0,\ 2.5,$ and 3.0 to indicate what would be necessary to be compatible with the current 1σ range for $A_{FB}^{new}(m_{t\bar{t}} > 450 \text{ GeV})$. Of course, a lower value of this high invariant-mass asymmetry (at the two sigma level for example) also opens up the allowed parameter space as indicated by the dashed red lines in the Figure.

In Figure 9 we consider the constraints from the charge asymmetry and cross-section at LHC7. We have indicated several contours for A_C^{new} to compare with the different results found by ATLAS and CMS.



FIG. 7: Color-octet (left panel) vs color-singlet (right panel) parameter space for couplings allowed by the Tevatron cross-section and forward-backward asymmetry.



FIG. 8: Color-octet (left panel) vs color-singlet (right panel) parameter space for couplings allowed by the high invariant mass LHC7 cross-section and high invariant mass Tevatron forward-backward asymmetry. The black lines are contours for higher values of $\sigma(m_{t\bar{t}} > 950$ GeV) at LHC7 than allowed by the current ATLAS measurement. The dashed red lines illustrate the 2σ contour for $A_{FB}^{new}(m_{t\bar{t}} > 450$ GeV).

For our numerical study we have used a mass of 500 GeV for the new color-octet boson as an illustration. But we also generated similar samples for 600 GeV and smaller samples for masses ranging between 400 GeV and 1 TeV. For all cases we found that the correlations between the different observables are very similar to those exhibited in Figures 1-5. The value of A_{FB} for masses higher than 500 GeV that is obtained keeping the couplings fixed gets smaller with increasing mass. For a



FIG. 9: Color-octet (left panel) vs color-singlet (right panel) parameter space for couplings allowed by the LHC7 cross-section and charge asymmetry.

mass of 600 GeV, for example, the range of A_{FB} shown in Figures 1-5 can be covered by increasing the couplings used by about 0.2 in each case. For heavier bosons this becomes harder to do as couplings would move into non-perturbative regimes. By the time masses reach 1 TeV it is only possible to generate very small values of A_{FB}. We also simulated events for the benchmark point ($m_V = 300$ GeV) for the model "Vector field VII_O" of reference [46] (corresponding to our V_8^+); as well as for the points in Table IV, model C8V of Ref. [70] (corresponding to our V_8^0) and we are in rough agreement in these cases.

V. CONCLUSION

We have studied the effect from a neutral V_8^0 or charged V_8^+ color-octet vector exchanged in the t-channel on the top-quark forward-backward asymmetry. We find that they can modestly increase the SM value of A_{FB}, to within the 1σ range from the Tevatron measurement. The color-octets fare better than the color-singlets when confronted with other constraints. In particular they generate a lower A_C, a lower high-invariant mass cross-section at LHC7 and a lower same sign top-pair cross-section. We have studied the correlations between the different observables for a mass of 500 GeV and the corresponding parameter space that is still allowed. We find that this type of new physics is still consistent with the measurements at the two sigma level.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the DOE under contract number DOE under contract number de-sc0009974. We are grateful to Chunhui Chen for useful discussions, to Kingman Cheung for discussions of the models with a W', to Alex Kagan for clarifications on Ref. [46] and to Moira Gresham for clarifications on Ref. [70].

Appendix A: Approximate results for $m_V = 500$ GeV

We generated samples of one million events for at least 40 points in g_{W_R}, g_{Z_R} parameter space with resonance masses of 500 GeV and widths of 50 GeV (although the precise value of the width is not important for t-channel resonances). Using these points we performed a fit to a quartic polynomial in these couplings (of the form that occurs in an analytic calculation) to obtain approximate expressions for the different observables. These expressions were then used in our exploration of parameter space. The results of these fits for color-octet resonances and for Tevatron observables are

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(p\bar{p} \to t\bar{t}) &\approx (6.06 + 0.325 g_{Z_R}^2 + 0.245 g_{Z_R}^4 + 0.074 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.037 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
\sigma \cdot A_{FB} &= (0.012 + 0.132 g_{Z_R}^2 + 0.176 g_{Z_R}^4 + 0.028 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.025 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
A_{FB}(M_{t\bar{t}} \geq 450 \text{ GeV}) &= (38.6 g_{Z_R}^2 + 42.6 g_{Z_R}^4 + 5.02 g_{W_R}^2 + 6.86 g_{W_R}^4) \times 10^{-3}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for the case of A_{FB} (but not for A_{FB} at high invariant mass) our fit is for A_{FB} times the cross-section. The constant term in this expression is the electroweak contribution in the SM as calculated by `MadGraph 5`. For for color-octet resonances and LHC observables at a 7 TeV energy we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(pp \to t\bar{t}) &\approx (96.33 + 1.115 g_{Z_R}^2 + 1.245 g_{Z_R}^4 + 0.877 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.719 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
\sigma \cdot A_C &= (0.1 + 0.261 g_{Z_R}^2 + 0.632 g_{Z_R}^4 + 0.040 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.290 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
\sigma(pp \to t\bar{t})(M_{t\bar{t}} \geq 950 \text{ GeV}) &= (1.2 + 0.042 g_{Z_R}^2 + 0.294 g_{Z_R}^4 + 0.050 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.147 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb}
\end{aligned}$$

The results of our fits for color-singlet resonances and for Tevatron observables are

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(p\bar{p} \to t\bar{t}) &\approx (6.06 - 2.423 g_{Z_R}^2 + 1.106 g_{Z_R}^4 - 0.407 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.167 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
\sigma \cdot A_{FB} &= (0.012 - 1.046 g_{Z_R}^2 + 0.800 g_{Z_R}^4 - 0.158 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.113 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
A_{FB}(M_{t\bar{t}} \geq 450 \text{ GeV}) &= (96.1 g_{Z_R}^2 + 36.0 g_{Z_R}^4 + 19.8 g_{W_R}^2 + 10.1 g_{W_R}^4) \times 10^{-3}
\end{aligned}$$

For for color-singlet resonances and LHC observables at a 7 TeV energy we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(pp \to t\bar{t}) &\approx (96.33 - 8.40 g_{Z_R}^2 + 5.61 g_{Z_R}^4 - 4.79 g_{W_R}^2 + 3.22 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
\sigma \cdot A_C &= (0.1 - 2.82 g_{Z_R}^2 + 2.92 g_{Z_R}^4 - 1.10 g_{W_R}^2 + 1.15 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb} \\
\sigma(pp \to t\bar{t})(M_{t\bar{t}} \geq 950 \text{ GeV}) &= (1.2 - 0.482 g_{Z_R}^2 + 1.28 g_{Z_R}^4 - 0.254 g_{W_R}^2 + 0.675 g_{W_R}^4) \text{ pb}
\end{aligned}$$

[1] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 142002 (2008) [arXiv:0712.0851 [hep-ex]].

[2] J. H. Kuhn and G. Rodrigo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 49 (1998) [hep-ph/9802268].

[3] J. H. Kuhn and G. Rodrigo, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 054017 (1999) [hep-ph/9807420].

[4] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **87**, 092002 (2013) [arXiv:1211.1003 [hep-ex]].

[5] V. Ahrens, A. Ferroglia, M. Neubert, B. D. Pecjak and L. L. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 074004 (2011) [arXiv:1106.6051 [hep-ph]].

[6] P. Ferrario and G. Rodrigo, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 094018 (2008) [arXiv:0809.3354 [hep-ph]].

[7] P. Ferrario and G. Rodrigo, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 051701 (2009) [arXiv:0906.5541 [hep-ph]].

[8] P. H. Frampton, J. Shu and K. Wang, Phys. Lett. B **683**, 294 (2010) [arXiv:0911.2955 [hep-ph]].

[9] R. Barcelo, A. Carmona, M. Masip and J. Santiago, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 014024 (2011) [arXiv:1105.3333 [hep-ph]].

[10] U. Haisch and S. Westhoff, JHEP **1108**, 088 (2011) [arXiv:1106.0529 [hep-ph]].

[11] R. Barcelo, A. Carmona, M. Masip and J. Santiago, Phys. Lett. B **707**, 88 (2012) [arXiv:1106.4054 [hep-ph]].

[12] G. Marques Tavares and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 054008 (2011) [arXiv:1107.0978 [hep-ph]].

[13] E. Alvarez, L. Da Rold, J. I. S. Vietto and A. Szynkman, JHEP **1109**, 007 (2011) [arXiv:1107.1473 [hep-ph]].

[14] J. Drobnak, J. F. Kamenik and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 054022 (2012) [arXiv:1205.4721 [hep-ph]].

[15] M. Gresham, J. Shelton and K. M. Zurek, JHEP **1303**, 008 (2013) [arXiv:1212.1718 [hep-ph]].

[16] C. Delaunay, O. Gedalia, S. J. Lee, G. Perez and E. Ponton, Phys. Lett. B **703**, 486 (2011) [arXiv:1101.2902 [hep-ph]].

[17] A. Djouadi, G. Moreau, F. Richard and R. K. Singh, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 071702 (2010) [arXiv:0906.0604 [hep-ph]].

[18] A. Djouadi, G. Moreau and F. Richard, Phys. Lett. B **701**, 458 (2011) [arXiv:1105.3158 [hep-ph]].

[19] G. Burdman, L. de Lima and R. D. Matheus, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 035012 (2011) [arXiv:1011.6380 [hep-ph]].

[20] E. Alvarez, L. Da Rold and A. Szynkman, JHEP **1105**, 070 (2011) [arXiv:1011.6557 [hep-ph]].

[21] S. Jung, H. Murayama, A. Pierce and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 015004 (2010) [arXiv:0907.4112 [hep-ph]].

[22] S. Jung, A. Pierce and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 114039 (2011) [arXiv:1103.4835 [hep-ph]];

[23] J. Cao, L. Wang, L. Wu and J. M. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 074001 (2011) [arXiv:1101.4456 [hep-ph]].

[24] B. Bhattacherjee, S. S. Biswal and D. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 091501 (2011) [arXiv:1102.0545 [hep-ph]].
[25] S. K. Gupta, arXiv:1011.4960 [hep-ph].
[26] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and M. Pérez-Victoria Phys. Lett. B **701**, 93 (2011) [arXiv:1104.1385 [hep-ph]].
[27] E. L. Berger, Q. H. Cao, C. R. Chen, C. S. Li and H. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 201801 (2011) [arXiv:1101.5625 [hep-ph]].
[28] E. R. Barreto, Y. A. Coutinho and J. Sa Borges, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 054006 (2011) [arXiv:1103.1266 [hep-ph]].
[29] P. Ko, Y. Omura and C. Yu, Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2269 (2013) [arXiv:1205.0407 [hep-ph]].
[30] J. Drobnak, A. L. Kagan, J. F. Kamenik, G. Perez and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 094040 (2012) [arXiv:1209.4872 [hep-ph]].
[31] E. Alvarez and E. C. Leskow, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 114034 (2012) [arXiv:1209.4354 [hep-ph]].
[32] K. Cheung, W. Y. Keung and T. C. Yuan, Phys. Lett. B **682**, 287 (2009) [arXiv:0908.2589 [hep-ph]].
[33] K. Cheung and T. C. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 074006 (2011) [arXiv:1101.1445 [hep-ph]].
[34] Q. H. Cao, D. McKeen, J. L. Rosner, G. Shaughnessy and C. E. M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 114004 (2010) [arXiv:1003.3461 [hep-ph]].
[35] V. Barger, W. Y. Keung and C. T. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 113009 (2010) [arXiv:1002.1048 [hep-ph]].
[36] V. Barger, W. Y. Keung and C. T. Yu, Phys. Lett. B **698**, 243 (2011) [arXiv:1102.0279 [hep-ph]].
[37] M. Frank, A. Hayreter and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 114007 (2011) [arXiv:1108.0998 [hep-ph]].
[38] J. Shelton and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 091701 (2011) [arXiv:1101.5392 [hep-ph]].
[39] J. Shu, T. M. P. Tait and K. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 034012 (2010) [arXiv:0911.3237 [hep-ph]].
[40] A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik and C. H. Chen, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 034034 (2010) [arXiv:0911.4875 [hep-ph]].
[41] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 055009 (2010) [arXiv:0912.0972 [hep-ph]].
[42] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 094015 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2604 [hep-ph]].
[43] K. M. Patel and P. Sharma, JHEP **1104**, 085 (2011) [arXiv:1102.4736 [hep-ph]].
[44] Z. Ligeti, M. Schmaltz and G. M. Tavares, JHEP **1106**, 109 (2011) [arXiv:1103.2757 [hep-ph]].
[45] B. Grinstein, A. L. Kagan, M. Trott and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 012002 (2011) [arXiv:1102.3374 [hep-ph]].
[46] B. Grinstein, A. L. Kagan, J. Zupan and M. Trott, JHEP **1110**, 072 (2011) [arXiv:1108.4027 [hep-ph]].
[47] K. Blum, Y. Hochberg and Y. Nir, JHEP **1110**, 124 (2011) [arXiv:1107.4350 [hep-ph]].

[48] D. W. Jung, P. Ko, J. S. Lee and S. h. Nam, Phys. Lett. B **691**, 238 (2010) [arXiv:0912.1105 [hep-ph]].
[49] C. Degrande, J. M. Gerard, C. Grojean, F. Maltoni and G. Servant, JHEP **1103**, 125 (2011) [arXiv:1010.6304 [hep-ph]].
[50] K. Blum, C. Delaunay, O. Gedalia, Y. Hochberg, S. J. Lee, Y. Nir, G. Perez and Y. Soreq, Phys. Lett. B **702**, 364 (2011) [arXiv:1102.3133 [hep-ph]].
[51] J. N. Ng and P. T. Winslow, JHEP **1202**, 140 (2012) [arXiv:1110.5630 [hep-ph]].
[52] E. Gabrielli and M. Raidal, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 054017 (2011) [arXiv:1106.4553 [hep-ph]].
[53] E. Gabrielli, M. Raidal and A. Racioppi, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 074021 (2012) [arXiv:1112.5885 [hep-ph]].
[54] E. Gabrielli, A. Racioppi, M. Raidal and H. Veermae, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 5, 054001 (2013) [arXiv:1212.3272 [hep-ph]].
[55] D. Y. Shao, C. S. Li, J. Wang, J. Gao, H. Zhang and H. X. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 054016 (2011) [arXiv:1107.4012 [hep-ph]].
[56] S. S. Biswal, S. Mitra, R. Santos, P. Sharma, R. K. Singh and M. Won, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 014016 (2012) [arXiv:1201.3668 [hep-ph]].
[57] J. Cao, Z. Heng, L. Wu and J. M. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 014016 (2010) [arXiv:0912.1447 [hep-ph]].
[58] D. Choudhury, R. M. Godbole, S. D. Rindani and P. Saha, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 014023 (2011) [arXiv:1012.4750 [hep-ph]].
[59] M. I. Gresham, I. W. Kim and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 114027 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3501 [hep-ph]].
[60] Y. Bai, J. L. Hewett, J. Kaplan and T. G. Rizzo, JHEP **1103**, 003 (2011) [arXiv:1101.5203 [hep-ph]].
[61] J. L. Hewett, J. Shelton, M. Spannowsky, T. M. P. Tait and M. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 054005 (2011) [arXiv:1103.4618 [hep-ph]].
[62] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and M. Perez-Victoria, JHEP **1109**, 097 (2011) [arXiv:1107.0841 [hep-ph]].
[63] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and M. Perez-Victoria, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 115013 (2011) [arXiv:1105.4606 [hep-ph]].
[64] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and M. Pérez-Victoria, JHEP **1105**, 034 (2011) [arXiv:1103.2765 [hep-ph]].
[65] C. Delaunay, O. Gedalia, Y. Hochberg, G. Perez and Y. Soreq, JHEP **1108**, 031 (2011) [arXiv:1103.2297 [hep-ph]].
[66] S. Westhoff, PoS EPS -HEP2011, 377 (2011) [arXiv:1108.3341 [hep-ph]].
[67] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Nuovo Cim. C **035N3**, 167 (2012) [arXiv:1202.2382 [hep-ph]].
[68] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and A. Juste, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 211804 (2012) [arXiv:1205.1898 [hep-ph]].
[69] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra and M. Perez-Victoria, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **447**, 012015 (2013) [arXiv:1302.6618 [hep-ph]].
[70] M. I. Gresham, I. -W. Kim and K. M. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 014022 (2012) [arXiv:1107.4364 [hep-ph]].
[71] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 202001 (2008) [arXiv:0806.2472 [hep-ex]].
[72] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **83**, 112003 (2011)

[arXiv:1101.0034 [hep-ex]].
[73] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **84**, 112005 (2011) [arXiv:1107.4995 [hep-ex]].
[74] M. T. Bowen, S. D. Ellis and D. Rainwater, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 014008 (2006) [hep-ph/0509267].
[75] L. G. Almeida, G. F. Sterman and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 014008 (2008) [arXiv:0805.1885 [hep-ph]].
[76] V. Ahrens, A. Ferroglia, M. Neubert, B. D. Pecjak and L. -L. Yang, JHEP **1109**, 070 (2011) [arXiv:1103.0550 [hep-ph]].
[77] J. H. Kuhn and G. Rodrigo, JHEP **1201**, 063 (2012) [arXiv:1109.6830 [hep-ph]].
[78] W. Hollik and D. Pagani, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 093003 (2011) [arXiv:1107.2606 [hep-ph]].
[79] W. Bernreuther and Z. -G. Si, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 034026 (2012) [arXiv:1205.6580 [hep-ph]].
[80] P. Skands, B. Webber and J. Winter, JHEP **1207**, 151 (2012) [arXiv:1205.1466 [hep-ph]].
[81] S. Hoeche, J. Huang, G. Luisoni, M. Schoenherr and J. Winter, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 014040 (2013) [arXiv:1306.2703 [hep-ph]].
[82] T. A. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF and D0 Collaborations], arXiv:1309.7570 [hep-ex].
[83] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler and A. Mitov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 252004 (2013) [arXiv:1303.6254 [hep-ph]].
[84] CMS Collaboration [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-TOP-11-030.
[85] [ATLAS Collaboration], ATLAS-CONF-2012-057.
[86] [ATLAS Collaboration], ATLAS-CONF-2012-024.
[87] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], JHEP **1211**, 067 (2012) [arXiv:1208.2671 [hep-ex]].
[88] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2261 (2013) [arXiv:1207.5644 [hep-ex]].
[89] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2339 (2013) [arXiv:1211.2220 [hep-ex]].
[90] E. Yazgan [for the ATLAS and CDF and CMS and D0 Collaborations], arXiv:1312.5435 [hep-ex].
[91] E. Farhi and L. Susskind, Phys. Rept. **74**, 277 (1981).
[92] E. Eichten, I. Hinchliffe, K. D. Lane and C. Quigg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **56**, 579 (1984) [Addendum-ibid. **58**, 1065 (1986)].
[93] K. Lane and S. Mrenna, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 115011 (2003) [hep-ph/0210299].
[94] B. Gripaios, A. Papaefstathiou and B. Webber, JHEP **1311**, 105 (2013) [arXiv:1309.0810 [hep-ph]].
[95] T. Stelzer and W. F. Long, Comput. Phys. Commun. **81**, 357 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9401258]; J. Alwall *et al.*, JHEP **0709**, 028 (2007) [arXiv:0706.2334 [hep-ph]]; J. Alwall, M. Herquet, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, T. Stelzer, JHEP **1106**, 128 (2011). [arXiv:1106.0522 [hep-ph]].
[96] N. D. Christensen and C. Duhr, Comput. Phys. Commun. **180**, 1614 (2009) [arXiv:0806.4194 [hep-ph]].